UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :

CR-15-0087

-against-

United States Courthouse

ARNOLVIN UMANZOR VELASQUEZ, : Central Islip, New York

Defendant. : November 15, 2016

2:48 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH F. BIANCO
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: ROBERT L. CAPERS, ESQ.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

610 Federal Plaza

Central Islip, New York 11722

BY: JOHN J. DURHAM, ESQ. RAYMOND TIERNEY, ESQ.

PAUL SCOTTI, ESQ.

For the Defendant: GARY S. VILLANUEVA, ESQ.

11 Park Place, Suite 1601 New York, New York 10007

Official Court Reporter: Ellen S. Combs, CSR

100 Federal Plaza - Suite 1180

Central Islip, New York 11722

Phone (631) 712-6107 Fax (631) 712-6123

PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY
TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED BY CAT

	2
1	(The following took place at 2:48 p.m.)
2	THE CLERK: Calling case 15-CR-87, USA vs
3	Umanzor Velasquez.
4	Counsel, please state your appearance for the
5	record.
6	(Appearances above noted.)
7	THE COURT: Mr. Umanzor Velasquez is present
8	with the assistance of the Spanish interpreter who is on
9	staff here. I'll just ask that she identify herself for
10	the record.
11	THE INTERPRETER: Good afternoon, your Honor.
12	Maya Gray, Spanish interpreter.
13	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Gray.
14	We are here for sentencing. Are both sides
15	ready to proceed?
16	MR. DURHAM: Yes, your Honor.
17	MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: I just want to review the
19	documentation that the court has and make sure I received
20	everything you have submitted. I also want to make sure I
21	have everything that is before the court.
22	I did receive, obviously, the presentence
23	investigation report and the recommendation of 45 years in
24	jail.
25	I received Mr. Villanueva's sentencing letter of

1 November 1st with attached letters in support of the 2 defendant, as well as certain records to establish his 3 working in Georgia, and other exhibits. I have received the government's November 14th 5 letter and exhibit attaching certain tattoos. 6 And I have received a letter from the defendant 7 which sounds like a motion for 30 years. And probation was written on top, but it was filed in April 4th of 2016. 8 9 Obviously I have considered that as well. 10 Anything else the Court should have in 11 connection with sentencing from the government? 12 MR. DURHAM: No, your Honor. 13 MR. VILLANUEVA: No, your Honor. 14 MR. DURHAM: And Mr. Villanueva, have you and 15 your client seen the presentence report and the 16 recommendation? 17 MR. VILLANUEVA: We have, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: And did you have sufficient time to 19 discuss it? 20 MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, I have. 21 THE COURT: Let me just confirm that. 22 Mr. Umanzor Velasquez, have you had sufficient time to; first of all, have you received and reviewed the 23 24 presence sentence report and the recommendation? 25 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And have you had sufficient time to discuss it with Mr. Villanueva?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay, before I deal with objections, just one thing I want to clarify based on my own reading of the presentence report. Obviously I want to make sure we're all on the same page.

The defendant pled guilty in connection with the murder of the Ceron brothers. The presentence report also makes reference to an attempted murder of John Doe Number 1 in April of 2011. And I want to make sure we're on the same page. Understand I am considering that as relevant conduct in connection with this sentencing. However, I just want to confirm that although it is mentioned in connection with the Ceron brothers' murder, the attempted murder of John Doe Number 3, based upon a description in the presentence report, it doesn't indicate any action by Mr. Velasquez. So I would not consider that as relevant conduct. Because for example, if he fired any shots in connection with the shooting of John Doe Number 3.

So I just want to make sure we're all on the same page on both of those things.

MR. DURHAM: I don't think he actually has culpability, however, for purposes of sentencing. We're not asking the Court to rely on that. We're not seeking a

1 Fatico Hearing to prove the defendant's guilt in 2 connection with that offense. 3 THE COURT: Okav. Mr. Villanueva, do you agree and understand, and 5 does your client understand I'm sentencing on the murder 6 of the Ceron brothers as well as the attempted murder of John Doe Number 1, correct? MR. VILLANUEVA: We do understand that. 8 9 THE COURT: So that is what I'm considering. 10 I'm not considering, for reasons stated, that it can't be 11 proved by a Fatico Hearing and the defendant is not 12 agreeing to any consideration of any culpability with 13 respect to John Doe Number 3. So I'm not considering 14 that. 15 Okay, do you have any objections to the 16 presentence report? 17 MR. VILLANUEVA: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Does the government have any 19 objections to the presentence report? 20 MR. DURHAM: No objection, judge. 21 Just one point of clarification. On page 1 it 22 has a June 10, 2015 arrest date. I believe that is the 23 day he arrived in the Eastern District. He was actually arrested on May 19, 2015 in Georgia. 24

THE COURT: Is that accurate, Mr. Villanueva?

25

1 MR. VILLANUEVA: That is correct.

THE COURT: So I amend it at counsel's request to an arrest date of May 19, 2015.

With that correction I adopt the information contained in the presentence report as factual findings by the Court pursuant to United States vs Booker. The sentencing guidelines are advisory. They're only one factor the Court is to consider among all of the statutory factors.

The total offense level in the presentence report is a 42. The defendant has no criminal history, so it's Criminal History Category I, which generates the 360 months to life advisory range.

Do both sides agree that is the calculation of the advisory range?

MR. DURHAM: Yes, your Honor.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I adopt the calculation in the presentence report in its entirety despite a summary in connection with Count 22, the use of a firearm to murder Enston Ceron. That's a level 43. Count 25, use of a firearm to murder Ricardo Ceron. That's also a level 43.

In a multi-count adjustment 2 levels are added, so a level 45. And since the defendant pleaded guilty in a timely fashion, he is entitled to a 3 level reduction

for timely acceptance of responsibility, which results in the total offense level of 42, resulting in an advisory range of 360 to life, 360 months to life. Obviously it's only advisory. It's only one factor the Court is to consider among all of the other statutory factors.

And I'll now hear from both sides as far as any facts you wish to address, or anything you wish to say.

Starting with Mr. Villanueva.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

Would the Court mind if I go to the podium?

THE COURT: Sure. You may remain seated if you want to.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Okay, thank you very much.

May it please the Court.

As your Honor just pointed out, Mr. Velasquez entered a guilty plea in this case and in so doing accepted responsibility for his actions, thereby saving the Court considerable time and resources, as well as resources for the prosecution.

Mr. Velasquez is 23 years old today. He is a young man who is married, the father of three children, and has a large family who is sitting in this courtroom today in support, right behind us on my right. His mom, his dad, his siblings, and extended family are all here in support of Mr. Velasquez.

As your Honor knows from our sentencing submission we have asked the Court to consider various sentencing factors in mitigation. We have asked the Court to consider the fact that he entered a guilty plea as a factor, and the fact that he did so publicly in what we believe and submit is a fact of remorse and an act of redemption.

In addition, your Honor. We ask that you consider his age at the time of his conduct, and his age at the time that he joined the gang, which we believe it is significant for the reasons set forth by the United States Supreme Court in cases beginning or culminating with Miller vs Alabama.

We have also asked the Court to consider in mitigation what we termed as the perfect duress and coercion. And we believe the facts and the circumstances of this case demonstrate coercion.

And lastly and most significantly we would ask the Court to consider Mr. Velasquez demonstrated post-conduct rehabilitation. And we believe those factors, in balance with the heinousness of this crime, and it was very serious and heinous, and his age; we believe the Court has the room and the discretion to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not overly harsh, and that demonstrates to the community just punishment for

1 Mr. Velasquez, but also that gives him hope for what he 2 has demonstrated, and that, is rehabilitation, his own 3 rehabilitation.

We raised the post-conduct rehabilitation, age and duress, not to minimize his conduct, but to give this Court a sense of the circumstances of his life, and the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime. He should not be punished more severely because he provided the Court with the information the Court, we believe, needs to make a careful sentencing decision.

As the presentence report indicates, your Honor, the Ceron brothers, there was an order to kill the Ceron brothers because one of the Ceron brothers, Enston, was distancing himself from the gang. And that is a significant fact. Because the fact that he was distancing himself from the gang led the leadership of the gang to consider and to order his murder. And the gang also ordered the murder of his brother, not because the brother was distancing himself, but because the brother was a committed gang member, and they feared retribution.

I think we should stop right there and look at that fact and that fact alone to show what Mr. Velasquez was laboring under. He was laboring under a real life situation where it was kill or be killed. If they were going to kill the brother for distancing himself, what

would they do to a guy would said, no, to them? That is a real life circumstance.

Now the government will argue that he knew what he was getting into when he joined the gang. And that is an appropriate argument. And the Court should consider it for what it's worth. But he was 17 years old when he joined the gang. And what we do know from Miller vs Alabama, and all of the other cases about age, is that age has hallmark characteristics that affect a person's blameworthiness, that affect a person's ability to assess risk, that affects his ability to extricate himself from dangerous and terrible circumstances.

And we ask your Honor to consider the Supreme Court's instructions to both the District Court and to all of us, that young people are different. And we submit to this Court that a 17 year old kid could not, and did not, and my client did not assess that risk properly. And when he was an 18 year old guy, young man, facing that choice of kill or be killed, he killed. And he stands here sorry for that, and remorseful for that.

And what did he do afterwards? And that's the important thing. What did he do? If he was a committed gang member he would have, and if the government is to believe that his entire set was dismantled, that what he would have done as a committed gang member was to go to

'

another set. And committed gang members don't stop being a gang member. A committed gang member continues on and on, and he would have done that.

But instead Mr. Velasquez became a father. He got married, obtained legitimate employment, on the books employment, not one job but two. But he didn't he stop there, your Honor. He filed taxes. He applied for healthcare. He left the environment where the gang thrived and moved to Georgia. And in Georgia he had two jobs. And in fact when he was arrested in this very case on May 19th he was on his way to his second job. And he demonstrated that to your Honor.

So what we have, we have a guy who has shown, a young man who has shown through his very actions a desire to rehabilitate himself, a desire to change his life. And what other indications does the Court have that he has done that? In the almost four years there was no arrest. In the almost four years, between the murder and today, there was no gang activity that the government can point to. He didn't do anything else. And also, your Honor, when he was in the Nassau County Jail for over, almost two years, he has no disciplinary actions, none. And I believe from this Court's experience, and these types of cases, that is pretty rare and pretty unique. That is a further action and reflection of Mr. Velasquez's desire to

change his life, which he actually did.

Now the Court I'm sure is concerned about, as the government is, that he attended meetings. And that his actions after the shooting of the Ceron brothers is questionable.

But I ask the Court to consider the following.

The fact that he participated in gang meetings and recounted his crimes, and got a gang tattoo, does not negate as imperfect as duress and coercion are on him. To state the obvious, duress does not end at the killing of the brothers.

Mr. Velasquez's ongoing enthusiastic participation in the gang should be expected because he was very much aware what would happen to him if he wasn't enthusiastic, if he didn't play a role, if he didn't show that commitment. He would have ended up like the Ceron brothers, I submit to the Court.

Now your Honor, I'm not asking that the Court apply the imperfect duress and coercion defense in toto. We believe that it's a mitigating factor, that you can consider it. And if you consider that, and consider the fact that after the Ceron brothers, there's very little, if any, contact between Mr. Velasquez and the gang. And in four years of conduct outside of the gang, his legitimate employment, his lifestyle has changed, the fact

that he is married and committed to his family, we believe
those are the legitimate sentencing factors that you can
consider.

So what have we got? We have a young man who was in his teens at the time of this crime. We have a young man who came into this country not speaking the language, and what is unfortunately, introduced into a culture that was destructive. And he felt that destruction. He understands that his conduct is going to take the majority of his life away from him. And he is ready to accept that. He understands that. And that is what he did when he accepted this guilty plea here. He knows that he is facing an enormous amount of time in jail. And he deserves it, and he understands that.

But he is asking this Court to give him some hope. He is asking this Court to provide some hope, not because of his age, but because of his demonstrated activities, his demonstrated rehabilitation, his acts in furtherance of trying to be moral and peaceful, which he has done; the fact that he is a family man now, the fact that he has worked two jobs. The fact that he has legitimate employment and a legitimate lifestyle is something that he is asking this Court to consider, to give him hope.

And we believe that a sentence of 30 years to

life or a 30 year sentence is such a significant sentence that it does give him that hope. And it does show the community and demonstrates to the community the seriousness of this offense.

But it also demonstrates that we understand that young people are different. We do understand that young people who get involved in these, this criminal activity sometimes they don't get involved with their eyes open, and a real understanding of what that means. And that they can change. And he can change, and he has changed already. And he is asking you to impose a sentence that reflects his change.

Now the government is indicating or suggests that the maximum sentence is required to address similar crimes, crimes that it knows occur regularly in this area. However, Courts have been handing out excessive and very lengthy sentences. And while that may be satisfying, it is really not having a deterrent effect, as this Court is well aware of the recent violent crimes in this area. It may be time that we view punishment and rehabilitation in another way. I'm not sure. But I do know that I am sure of this; that Mr. Velasquez has demonstrated an ability to live a peaceful and productive life.

While he should be punished, and we agree to that, we ask respectfully that the Court consider his

post-conduct, rehabilitation conduct, his age and the horrific circumstances that he labored under as an 18 year old when pressed and pushed to make the decision to be involved in the Ceron murders. It's a difficult question.

And lastly, the suggestion that society be protected from Mr. Velasquez, is less than accurate. He spent four years demonstrating that he is going to live a productive life. And we ask that the Court consider that four years and that change in his life as a significant mitigator, and consider it in imposing a sentence that we believe will demonstrate to the community the seriousness of this crime, but also give the community and young people like Mr. Velasquez, other young people, that if you're going to turn your, willing to turn your life around, if you're willing to demonstrate that you can work and live and get married and raise a family and live a productive life, that courts will take that into consideration. I think that is also important.

May I have a moment, your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

(There was a pause in the proceedings.)

MR. VILLANUEVA: I appreciate the time the Court has given me. And I know that sometimes sentencings are emotional and they are difficult. I know it's difficult for the Court as well as the parties. And I appreciate

the time.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Before I hear from your client, I just want to ask you one question on the imperfect duress defense argument.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

THE COURT: And obviously that is something the Court can consider, but I just, I don't understand. Assuming that I accept your version of why he left the area and established himself. Isn't that an argument against your imperfect duress defense? In other words, you pointing out to me that shortly after the Ceron murders he extricated himself from the gang. So the obvious question would be, doesn't that prove that he could have done that before the Ceron murders, if in fact he wanted to do that? He could have, he was involved in the attempted murder in April. So he certainly knew what the nature of the gang was by that time. Why didn't he extricate himself then? And why didn't he before the Ceron murders?

MR. VILLANUEVA: And that is a fair question, your Honor, a very fair question. And the answer to that is, that is a common sense response.

Remember, your Honor, he was between 17 and 18 years old. And while we expect people to act rationally,

and be able to assess their conduct and their consequences, what we do know from Miller and Alabama and those other cases, is that young people don't do that. That is the reason why they're less blameworthy. That is the reason why the Supreme Court has said we need to treat them differently.

And I submit to this Court that if we hold him to that standard of reasonableness, then we run afoul to the Supreme Court's jurisprudence for young people. And I believe that the answer is just very basic. That as a young person, he is a typical 18 year old who doesn't assess the risk, who is immature, who doesn't understand the consequences of his actions, who takes time to extricate himself from a dangerous and difficult situation. Those are comments and observations that the Supreme Court lists in their cases.

And I think they were speaking to young Mr. Velasquez, and speaking to his predicament and his circumstances. And I think he is just that typical person. He didn't get it the first time. But he certainly got it the second time. And when I say the second time, I'm saying at the time of the Ceron murders.

And I want to point out to the Court, while the government is asking for Mr. Velasquez to be held accountable for the shooting of the, what I call the good

18 1 samaritan, it's important to note that he didn't shoot 2 that gun at a good samaritan. And that seems to be a 3 suggestion that he was then walking the other way. That 4 the trauma of that incident was the light that he needed. 5 The trauma of what he did was so horrific that he did go 6 the other way. And he did turn the corner. And we do submit that to the Court. 8 I hope I have been responsive to your Honor's 9 question. 10 THE COURT: Yes. 11 MR. VILLANUEVA: Thank you. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Velasquez, you also have a right 13 to speak at your sentencing. You can remain seated. 14 did obviously review your letter. But you also have the 15 opportunity to speak today if you wish to say anything. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 With your Honor's permission, first of all, I 18 ask the family members of the deceased to forgive me from 19 the bottom of my heart. Because I have also made my 20 family suffer; my daughters, my mother, my father, my 21 wife. And I apologize to them. 22 I am suffering because I can not see my family. 23 But I know now that I cannot see them due to my own 24 I am responsible, and that is why they suffer. actions.

I distanced myself from the gang. I did not

25

want to participate in bad things. I wanted to change my life. I am sorry for what I did. I am sorry from my heart. And I ask you, your Honor, to have pity on me when you sentence me.

And once again I ask your Honor to forgive me.

And may God bless you.

THE COURT: Let me respond to what you said today. I'm giving you credit for accepting responsibility for what you have done, for showing remorse. So that deserves some credit.

There are people involved in gang activity who sit there even on the day of sentencing and still don't show remorse. They just show ongoing allegiance to the gang. So the fact that you have done that deserves some credit.

As you know, your lawyer obviously recognizes that there are other things I have to consider; the harm that you have done. And I see your family back there. I know your family and you understand how this affects your children, and the problem this creates for them. But the Ceron brothers are never going to see their family again because of your conduct.

So you caused a lot of harm, two people lost their lives. And the sentence has to reflect that harm that you have done.

But I will give you some credit for your acceptance of responsibility and your remorse that you have shown here today.

All right, I'll hear from the government.

MR. DURHAM: Your Honor, the defendant has shown some remorse. However, he continues to refer to his suffering and the suffering of his family, which is, as the Court pointed out, not remotely on par with the suffering of the Ceron family and so many other families who suffer from the violence created by the MS-13.

This defendant came to this country when he was 12 years old. He lived here for five years. He had a tremendous education, employment opportunity, but instead of taking advantage of those opportunities he joined the MS-13, not when he was 12, not when he was 13, but when he was 17 years old. He joined the gang knowing full well what the rules of the gang were, what they would require of him', specifically violence, violence against rival gang members, violence against MS-13 members who violated the rules.

We can not have a situation where people join these gangs knowing the rules throughout, and the horrific acts of violence, and then blame the rules of the gang for the acts they committed.

And your Honor asked Mr. Villanueva a very

simple question. He said, well I'll give you a common sense answer. And he answered it and talked for about five minutes.

The common sense answer is, that this defendant could have fled and could have lived a different life at any point before he committed the murders. These murders were not spontaneous events. They were not something that happened just the night of December 17th or the 18th. They talked about killing the Ceron brothers for weeks, if not months.

This defendant was at multiple meetings when this was discussed. He had multiple side conversations with other members of the gang. He knew this was the plan. He knew he was a member of the team that was supposed to carry it out. At any point he could have left. He could have left the gang. He could have gone to the police. He could have done many, many different things. Instead he continued to go to these meetings, he agreed to carry out the murder. He went to a party on December 17th, and then he got in the car and he put a gun to Ricardo Ceron's head and he pulled the trigger.

And after that he continued to associate with the gang up until the point where other gang leaders were arrested and incarcerated. He then fled out of self-interest, no other reason.

He went to El Salvador. And he was in El Salvador and he touched base with gang members then. He left El Salvador and he returned to the United States. He didn't come to New York, he moved to Georgia. He moved because of self-preservation, not out remorse, not out of rehabilitation. He didn't want to go to jail.

We are asking the Court to hold him responsible for the crimes he committed and to sentence him to 30 years posed by the defense, 15 years for each murder in the government's view is insufficient.

We're asking the Court to impose a sentence of 45 years for all of the 3553(a) factors, and that the Court consider the defendant's age, and consider the other factors as well, specifically the circumstances of this offense. Like I said, it wasn't a spontaneous event. It wasn't impulsive. It was a preplanned, cold-blooded murder.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Durham.

I'm now going to state the sentence I intend to impose. And I'll give the lawyers a final opportunity to make any legal objection before I impose the sentence.

In imposing this sentence I have carefully considered the factors that have been set forth by Congress in Section 3553(a). Those factors include, among others, and I'm not going to go through all of them now,

but they include among others the nature and circumstances of the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide a just punishment for the offense. I also need to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, and to protect the public from further crimes by the defendant.

Among the other factors that I have considered; the sentencing guideline issued by the sentencing commission, as well as included the advisory range in this case, as well as the applicable policy statements that have been issued by the sentencing commission. I also considered the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparity among similarly situated defendants. And I have sentenced a number of individuals for gang-related murders. I am certainly cognizant of trying to insure that the sentence is proportional to other defendants who are similarly situated.

The restitution factor, does the government have any restitution?

MR. DURHAM: No, your Honor. The victims' family did not file information for us to do so.

THE COURT: And the Court is also considering as both sides mentioned, and I think it is appropriate to

consider, although I'm assuming Mr. Velasquez was not a juvenile at the time this offense. I have considered more the Alabama factors because he was 18 at the time of the offense, and certainly some of the factors the Supreme Court mentioned in Miller could apply to someone at the age of 18. And I have assessed those factors in the context of this defendant in this case.

And having considered all of those factors, in my discretion I intend to impose a sentence of 40 years in prison, 480 months. And I'm going to explain the reasons for that sentence.

I have given the sentence careful thought. And I can't under-emphasize -- excuse me -- I can't overemphasize the heinous nature of this criminal conduct.

First, it was the attempted murder of John Doe number 1 which involved the defendant firing into a group of people hitting John Doe number 1 in the back. What were these individuals doing that warranted him shooting at them? They were socializing on Maryland Avenue outside their home. And because the defendant and some gang members were out for, quote, hunting for what they believe are rival gang members, John Doe number 1 was shot. But fortunately he survived that shooting. The defendant could then instead of, after a violent thing like that, dissociating himself from the gang he engaged in this

horrific execution of two brothers in a car in cold-blooded execution. The sentence that the Court imposes has to reflect the loss of two lives in December of 2011, and the injury to John Doe number 1.

The Court notes that Enston Ceron was killed because according to the gang he was distancing himself, as both sides noted. He wasn't violent enough. And for that they executed him. I view the defendant as an extremely heinous individual. I feel the public needs to be protected from him.

I also am considering the need for general deterrence. I don't know what impact the Court's sentences have on individuals who are involved in gang activity, including other individuals of Mr. Velasquez's age who are involved in violent activities, or who are thinking about engaging in this type of activity. But that does not dissuade me from the fact that that message needs to be sent.

As Mr. Durham noted in his sentencing letter, this Court alone has watched convictions in the order of two dozen murders over the past several years by this violent criminal enterprise, MS-13, all over Long Island in various communities. And a message needs to be sent that if you're involved in that gang activity, and if you engage in violence including violence as horrific as this,

executing two people on the streets of Long Island, you're going to go to jail for a long time, whether you're 20, whether your 22, or whether you're 18 as in the defendant's case. The need for general deterrence to deter this gang is substantial.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I did consider Mr. Villanueva's, as he always does he did an excellent job in his arguments to the Court, and various mitigating factors. I'm not giving credit for this imperfect arrest offense for reasons that are indicated in my questioning. The defendant, as Mr. Durham noted, the defendant joined the gang at 17, certainly under the age of 18. But it's not 13 or 14, as it is when some individuals who join the gangs. And to me most importantly, as it has been pointed out during my questioning, getting involved in a violent act in April of 2011 the defendant did not disassociate himself from the gang and move to another location. Whether or not if he could have advised law enforcement is a different question. But at a minimum to disassociate himself from the gang, move out of Long Island, go somewhere that he felt like because of the rules of the gang he chose to join, that he should need to engage in violent activity. And he didn't do that.

Instead he was involved in planning, and as Mr. Durham notes this was not a spur of the moment

decision when someone handed him a gun and said, we need you to shoot the Ceron brothers. It was explained about this. There was discussion about this and he stuck around to be the shooter, one of the two shooters in that execution. Nobody had a gun to his head. He could have left the area.

I don't believe that the Miller factors provide sufficient explanation for his decision to be involved in that double homicide after having been involved in an attempted murder just a few months before that. Even 18 year olds obviously are aware of the consequences of that type of action, how wrong those actions are, how evil they are. And despite the fact that their judgment may not be that of an adult, they certainly are aware of the nature of that type of conduct. And it is not in my view an explanation for why the defendant continued to be involved in the violent activity of this gang.

I also note, I think this is obvious, but I just want to emphasize. There is no secret when you join the MS-13 gang where you learn along the way, we are going to ask you to commit acts of violence. If you don't want to commit violence you could be subject to violence yourself. The MS-13 gang only exists for violence. It's not like it's this one activity within the group that involves nonviolence and this other activity that involves

violence. The MS-13 gang only exists for violence.

Everybody who joins that gang is aware of what the objective of that gang is. And certainly even at the age of 17 the defendant knew when he joined that gang the only reason to join that gang is to engage in violent activity. So it should come at no surprise to him that they asked him to carry out murders on behalf of the gang.

As I said, I considered his age and the other factors. I don't believe they warrant a substantially reduced sentence in this case for the reasons I have already indicated. And the factors, I think overwhelm any of those factors set forth in the Miller case.

I have considered him leaving the area.

Obviously I can't determine what was in the defendants mind. The government has a different reason for him leaving the area in terms of avoiding prosecution and gang members were being arrested. But I do believe he deserves some credit for not being involved in criminal activity in the years after the Ceron murders.

There is no indication that he made an attempt to rejoin the gang. The government mentioned contact with gang members in El Salvador, but I am not going to consider that. There is nothing in the record for me to consider that. So I am considering that mitigating factor. Although again, it is overwhelmed by the loss of

life here and all of the other factors that I have already gone into.

So I considered giving him a higher sentence as requested by the government. But I believe it was a little too high given the factors I pointed to, acceptance of responsibility and the fact that he did for some period of time start working and had a relationship with an individual, a woman, and had children, and appears to be not engaged in any type of criminal activity for that period of time.

I certainly considered giving him less. In my discretion, and I know Mr. Villanueva is advocating 30 years. But I don't believe anything less than 40 years would properly reflect and balance the need to find a just punishment for the execution of two individuals and the attempted murder of a third individual and the need for deterrence and protection of the public from Mr. Velasquez and from other gang members to hopefully send the message of general deterrence that is sent by this sentence.

The final factor that I want to make reference to is the issue of avoiding sentencing disparities among similarly situated defendants. Again, I have sentenced numerous MS-13 gang members on murders convictions; juveniles, adult. And I think this sentence is proportional to the other sentences I have imposed. I

have imposed some life sentences, some of them were mandatory life, but some of them were discretionary life sentences, even for juveniles. But those sentences, that involved the execution of a 19 year old woman and a two year old boy. And for all of the reasons I indicated for those sentences I believe that conduct warranted that increased punishment.

In terms of other sentences in this range for other gang members involved in murders, I have sentenced them, by way of one example -- was involved in the execution of an individual, a guard at a restaurant, a bar. I sentenced him to 405 months in jail, which is obviously less than this sentence. But I believe this sentence involves a double homicide and attempted murder and warrants a higher sentence than that particular sentence.

But in short, I'm not going to go through every other defendant. I believe this sentence is proportional to other sentences I have imposed on other defendants under similar circumstances, under the factors that I have mentioned. So that is how I arrived at this sentence.

I intend to impose 40 years on each count concurrent to each other. I do intend to impose five years of supervised release, although the defendant may be deported or removed from the United States. Given his

ties to the country, including children, and obviously this is a long sentence, but given his ties to the United States, his family members, even assuming he is removed from the United States because of this conviction, I believe a period of supervised release is necessary to insure that he does not attempt to return to the United States to reestablish his ties. Because doing so would be not an additional crime, but a violation of the conditions of release. And if he is in the United States for any period of time, he should be under supervision given his criminal activity and the special conditions that would be necessary to insure that he doesn't return to gang activity. So I want to impose those, as well as in the unlikely event that he stays in this country legally for any period of time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So that is the sentence I intend to impose. And I intend to impose no fine. I do intend to impose a \$200 special assessment, \$100 on each count. I'm imposing no fine because the defendant has no ability to pay a fine.

I intend to impose no restitution.

Any legal reason why I cannot impose that sentence?

MR. DURHAM: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Velasquez?

MR. VILLANUEVA: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Velasquez, the judgment of this court in its discretion is that you be sentenced to the custody of the Attorney General through the Bureau of Prisons to a term, total term of imprisonment of 40 years or 480 months, consisting of 480 months on Count 22, and 480 months on Count 25, to run concurrently to each other.

I impose five years of supervised release on each count which runs concurrently to each other under operation of law. I impose the standard conditions and the following five special conditions.

- You shall not possession a firearm,
 ammunition or destruction devise.
- 2. You shall submit your person and property; house, residence, vehicle, computers as defined in 18 USC Section 1030(e) or other electronics, communications or data storage devices or media or office to a search conducted by a United States probation officer. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release.

You shall warn any other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. An officer may conduct a search pursuant to this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that you have violated a condition of supervision, and the area to search contains evidence of this violation. Any search

has to be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

- 3. You shall not associate in person, through mail, telephone or electronic communication with any individual with an affiliation to any organized crime groups, gangs, or other criminal enterprise, pursuant, but not limited to a prohibition list provided by the US Probation Department, nor shall you frequent any establishment or other locale identified by the US Probation Department as a location where these persons or groups may be.
- 4. You shall cooperate with and abide by all instructions of immigration authorities.
- And 5. If deported you may not reenter the United States illegally.

I impose no fine. And I impose a \$100 special assessment on each count for a total of \$200. And I impose no restitution.

Mr. Umanzor Velasquez, I need to advise you of your statutory right to appeal.

To the extent that you did not waive your right to appeal in your plea agreement, you have a statutory right to appeal your conviction and sentence. If you can not afford to pay the cost of the appeal you may apply to appeal forma pauperis. If you could not afford an

attorney, one will be furnished to represent you on appeal. The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 day of the judgment of conviction.

Mr. Durham, do we need to dismiss any open counts?.

MR. DURHAM: We do, your Honor.

We move to dismiss any open counts in the second superseding indictment, as well as the first superseding indictment.

THE COURT: All right, all the open counts are dismissed.

I'll say this to the defendant's family who are here today. I know you support the defendant. I don't want my substantial sentence here to be a reflection that I didn't consider their letters and their support of the defendant. I understand that they love the defendant and support him. But the harm done and the other factors that I mentioned just overwhelmed the fact that he has family to support him when he gets out.

I expect them be there when he gets out. But these other factors that I pointed to warrant this sentence in my discretion. But I certainly understand their support of the defendant. Certainly he is lucky to have them, his family members.

All right, is there anything else from the